

**Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003**

**Date:** Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:46:51 -0700

**From:** "tecann" <tecann@pacbell.net>

**To:** "Andrew Mason" <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>

Mr. Mason, I doubt that our discussion could have been more enjoyable for you than it was for me. I have devoured your hard copies of papers on the JFK-associated papers. It is amusing to me to observe my reaction to reinforcement of my ideas and to see my immediate moves to justify my earlier conclusions and to explain them on the basis of other evidence shown. I am becoming more scatterbrained with advancing age, so my subsequent comments herein must be read with this decay in mind. The explanation for the eclipse of Connally's shoulder by the limo body or by the back of the jump seat is quite persuasive; I am moved to suggest that my testimony could well be revised to refer to the right side of Connally's head and not his shoulder would be appropriate. The resulting shift would not destroy the conclusion I drew. In another figure taken from one of the papers showing a photo taken through a telescopic sight during a reenactment of the event suggests that Connally was lucky and that it would have been difficult for the bullet to strike his thigh without killing him first.

I have had several occasions to look at many pictures of JFK and have concluded that he was turned further beyond a pure profile position than my analysis with the calibration pictures taken at the FAA laboratory. I believe that I was misled to some extent by the confusing background image of Mrs. K's pink suit and the lapel "notch" in her blouse. The resulting striking exaggeration of his nose size which resulted caused me to settle on a figure of that was as much as ten degrees too much to K's right. Oh! for photo resolution superior to that attainable with an amateur's 8mm camera!

A personal comment which I hope will be taken as intended to support your admirable effort at squeezing out all the reliable data from the raft of evidence available: You speak of "arm-chair experts". judgemental comments of this sort are doubtless valuable in adversarial discourse, but they do not strengthen your conclusions in what is essentially a scientific or at least objective discussion. Your explanation of the power of simultaneous eye-witness evidence impressed me particularly in view of my recently recognized poor performance in a stressful situation involving "freeway rage". I was able to reconstruct a minor incident and found that my recollection of the actions of another driver was so poor that I would be well advised to claim that I observed nothing of value.

I am typing this note after a complicated day and am sure that I should send this off to let you know at least a bit of my responses to your questions. I will try to add to the responses, but as you probably have realized I tend to wander.

Please feel to press me further if you conclude that I may be of assistance. I am a bit curious to learn what moved you to go into the JFK subject.

Sincerely, Tom Canning

----- Original Message -----

From: "Andrew Mason" <a.mason@dufourlaw.com>

To: "tecann" <tecann@pacbell.net>

Sent: Monday, March 31, 2003 4:56 PM

Subject: Re: jfk discussion with Andrew Mason, March 31, 2003

> *Mr. Canning,*

>

> *This is a list of the following papers that I have also mailed to*

> you. You will need Adobe Acrobat reader to view them.  
>  
> 1. Copy of letter sent to you by mail.  
>  
> 2. Paper on the shot pattern recalled by witnesses.  
>  
> 3. Paper on the single bullet theory.  
>  
> 4. Misc. sight line analyses.  
>  
> This is just a heads up message. I will attach the PDF files in  
> my next email.  
>  
> I look forward to discussing this further with you if it should  
> interest you.  
>  
> Thank you for mentioning Helen Nichol. I am very interested in  
> the synchrotron facility. It will be up and running starting next  
> year and we are all looking forward to some interesting research  
> and industrial activity being conducted here. The synchrotron web  
> site is: <http://www.lightsource.ca/>  
>  
> Best regards,  
>  
> Andrew Mason  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> > tecann wrote:  
> >  
> > The principal purpose of this note is to bridge the email gap  
> > resulting from SBC's gobbling up Pacific Bell and foising a  
> > lot of bookwork on their new customers. I anticipste that use  
> > of tecann@pacbell.net will work, but the more recent  
> > substitutes of sbcglobal.net will praobably survive longer. T  
> > he parenthetical address at the top of this note will probably  
> > work as well; I have never been kidnapped before so  
> > I'm winging it.  
> >  
> > I dug back in my bookcase and found the book on ballistic  
> > ranges and can now provide a proper reference without relying  
> > on memory, to wit:  
> >  
> > Ballistic Range Technology by: members of the stagg of Ames  
> > Research Center, National Aeronautica and Space Administration,  
> > Moffett Field, California, USA and Defence Research  
> > Establishment, Valcartier, Quebec, Canada. It is "AGARDograph  
> > No. 138.  
> >  
> > If I seem a bit dense when talking on the past it's because I  
> > am a bit dense these days. I shall try to compensate by being  
> > as deliberate as necessary to avoid misleading statements and  
> > opinion.  
> >  
> > The new faculty member I mentioned is Helen Nichol; She is  
> > associated with the Synchrotron facility.